

# THE

# COLONIAL NEWSLETTER

P.O. Box 4411

Huntsville, Alabama 35802

J.C. Spilman, Editor

Volume 10, No. 3

September, 1971

Serial No. 32

## A NEW OVERTYPE for the SIX over TWELVE SPECIMENS



Discovered by Theodore L. Craige

Comments by William J. Wild and ye editor.

(TN-29)

A fifth Six over Twelve specimen has come to light in this series of remarkable overstrikes, but this new discovery is unique in that it is a new overtype. The four previous discoveries have been Massachusetts Sixpence, Noe 21, struck over cutdown Noe 14 Oaktree Shillings. This new specimen is a Noe 20 over Noe 14 and is illustrated in the enlarged photograph. Striking juxtaposition is obverse/obverse and the weight is 34.95 grains. The coin is in very nice condition.

The specimen was discovered by the late Theodore L. Craige early this year just a few months prior to his untimely death on June 11, 1971. The specimen is now in a private collection.

The outstanding features of the undertype visible on this specimen are, on the reverse, the N from the shilling falls in front of ANO and appears as NANO. On the obverse the shilling A of MASATH appears over the left stand of the M of MASATH, and the crossbar and right stand of H appears above S of MASATH.

Now that a Noe 20 has been discovered perhaps someone will come up with a Noe 22.



Sequential page 328

# editor's notebook



Ted Craige - Numismatist  
His Last Discovery

We will miss Ted and his seemingly endless procession of numismatic discoveries, many of which have appeared in these pages over the years. His last discovery is the new Six over Twelve overtype illustrated on the cover page of this issue; there will be no more. Ted went to sleep the night of June 10, 1971, and just did not awaken the next morning. After years of service as Chief Engineer for United Transformer Company, Ted only recently managed to devote his full time to his first love - Colonial American numismatics. He was a dear and close friend to several of our Patrons and it is with a deep feeling of personal loss that we report to you this last of the "colonial cullings from craige's cabinet."

Our thanks to each of you who have responded to our letter request in early September for financial support. We have received replies from just under 50% of those on our mailing list (excluding those who have made voluntary contributions during the past several months and to whom we did not mail the request). If you have not yet responded to our letter please do so as soon as possible. We urgently need the funds to keep CNL going.

We need your specific suggestions regarding the content of the CNL DATABOOKS. The basic intent of the DATABOOKS was outlined on sequential pages 306 and 307 in the January 1971 issue. Your thoughts regarding organization of the volumes, their content, the type of presentation for photographic plates - i.e., enlarged illustrations vs. 1:1 reproduction, etc., will be helpful. In addition, if any of you would care to volunteer to help with the organization and editing for a particular series of coinage, please let us know.

What happened to the CNL Roster? A substantial number of our Patrons indicated that they did not want their names or addresses published in such a document. To do so might be an open invitation for burglary (the major concern) and other undesirable events. Accordingly, we will not publish a roster at the present time. The number of our CNL Patrons remains quite small, currently 125.

Our next project - following the Coins, Medals, and Seals DATABOOK reprint - will be the subject index for all issues of CNL. This is scheduled for completion early next year. It had been our intention to have the index ready long before now; however, many problems have delayed the work.

 The RESEARCH FORUM 

Observations on RF-27 The DANSKE AMERICANSK (CNL p.281; Dec. 1969)

●● from Walter H. Breen

If we accept any of the Dansk Amerikansk pieces as American colonials, where are we going to draw the line? These pieces were issued for many years beyond the Colonial period. If even one belongs, then so do all the rest. I personally do not think they have any place in the roster of American colonials. There was not that much trade use of them in the American colonies; in all likelihood, any that did get up here were treated like any other foreign silver (by weight) or copper, palmed off as halfpence or "coppers" at the local rate, but never given enough official attention to receive even a standard valuation. Significantly, I have never seen any in noncollector accumulations of colonials, nor have any shown up as undertypes of state coppers.

●● from Kenneth E. Bressett

Regarding the question about the Colonial coins used in the Danish West Indies, our Patrons might like to know that there is an excellent catalog coverage of this series in Whitman's book The Colonial Coinage of the U.S. Virgin Islands by Lincoln W. Higbie. Published in 1962, the book is Whitman's stock number 9360, and is currently available through most book stores, hobby shops, and coin dealers, or it may be purchased by writing directly to Department M, Whitman Publishing Company, Racine, Wisconsin 53404.

●● from ye editor

If one is to draw a line of demarcation this series of coinage certainly lends itself to the task in a straight forward and logical manner. The issues bearing a representation of a sailing ship of the Danish West India Company ended with the coinage dated 1767. The next issue, sans ship, did not appear until the year 1816. The last of these coins that would be a logical candidate for classification as an "American" colonial would be Higbie No. 150. As to the more basic question whether any of them should be considered as "Colonial American" it is probably just as logical to do so as it is to give similar consideration to the Sommer Island pieces, the VOCE POPULI, the William Wood's Hibernia coinage and other such pieces of questionable or uncertain origin, usage or intent.



# LETTERS

 and TECHNICAL NOTES

● ● from Charles E. Funk, Jr.  
East Granby, Connecticut

(TN-27A)

Your TN-27 (page 313) in the January 1971 issue of CNL prompts a response from me. I too have been interested in trying to track down the background of the word cent, and have done a modest amount of research into the question over the past few years. Herbert Silberman, who asks the question, is a member of the Early American Coppers Club (to which I also belong) which, despite its name, concerns itself mostly with U.S. large cents, somewhat with half-cents, and hardly at all with Colonial and State coinage whether or not of copper. Herb had also expressed his interest in trying to trace the origins of "cent" within the pages of the Club's bulletin, PENNY-WISE, and I put together my findings for them in a Letter to the Editor. I have edited the material somewhat for our CNL patrons.

Because of my closeness to Connecticut, I've given particularly close attention to the Connecticut "cents", and can state with absolute certainty that they were never officially so labelled. I have copies of the original legislation authorizing their issue, and of all later legislation concerning them throughout their official history. In all cases, they are referred to only as "coppers", and, where any other description is called for, they are stated as to be made of the size and weight of the British halfpenny. This legislation, as you may know, has been transcribed in full by Crosby in his "Early Coins of America", and I have carefully compared his text with the original, and found it to be accurate.

Properly, the term cent should have derived from the Latin centum, hundred, with the meaning associated with hundred-fold, rather than hundredth. In fact, the editors of the Oxford English Dictionary have traced cent (as hundred-fold) back to about 1400 A.D. in English, but have been able to find its use as hundredth no earlier than 1685, and neither of these by any means in a numismatic sense.

Putting together various bits and pieces of information that I have gathered from a number of sources, but relying most heavily on Crosby, the Oxford English Dictionary, and H. L. Mencken's The American Language, the following seems to work its way out of the mess. In the early 1780s, the monetary situation in the various States had become absolutely chaotic. Each State had its own standard of values, and the traveller, going from one to another, might find his pocket change radically either increased or decreased, in terms of buying power, upon crossing the State line. There was, as yet, no national standard.

A chap by the name of Gouverneur Morris (active both in New York and national politics), who must have been a pretty brilliant mathematician, studied all these State monetary laws, and found out that he could derive a hypothetical small unit of value of which each of the basic State monetary units was an even multiple. He called this theoretical value, not illogically, "one unit". A Pennsylvania penny turned out to be

worth sixteen "units"; a Georgia penny, twenty-four; a New York penny, fifteen; a Virginia penny, twenty; and so on. (These various pennies, you must keep in mind, did not necessarily exist in fact as coins issued by the States, but were the legal rate of exchange.)

Mr. Morris was also sold on the decimal system, and so he proposed a system of coinage for the Nation that was both decimalized and had a relation to the States' various monetary laws. Starting with his "unit"(which he never intended to be represented of itself as a coin - only that the coinage should be in multiples of the "unit"), he proposed that the smallest silver coin should represent 100 units, and that this be called a cent. Other multiples, he suggested, should be a quint (500 units) and mark (1000 units). These last terms were subsequently lost, but the important thing to recognize here is that the cent, as he proposed it, retained its etymologically correct sense of hundredfold; it was to be equal to 100 units !

Between the time that Morris made his suggestion(in 1782) and the Congress got around to doing something about it(not 'til 1786 was a coinage law passed, and not 'til 1792 was the mint authorized), many people had a hand in twisting his suggestions around to meet their own needs. We can be very sure that very few of them were either etymologists or mathematicians. Out of this came, as we know, the decision to retain the decimal system, and also the decision to retain the word cent, but lost in the welter of politics was the proper sense of hundredfold, and instead we have the less sound sense of hundredth. Morris retains credit for inventing the word, at least for coinage, but he should not bear the blame for its lack of etymological soundness.

Incidentally, the earliest use of cent by any other country that I have found is that of the Netherlands, in the 1830s.

The first actual use of cent on a coin was undoubtedly in Massachusetts. Someone in that States political system was smart enough to pick up the nomenclature from the Federal law of 1786 and put it to use as early as 1787. I can only presume that the other States were too hidebound in tradition to accept so radical a change so promptly.



●● from Eric P. Newman  
St. Louis, Missouri

Your Fugio data is great and I congratulate you on its concise presentation and interesting notations. It would now be wonderful if you had pictures published of every obverse and reverse die. Also ...., the letter from Eva Adams misses the point you were making when you wrote her. We were not Colonial in 1787!

**MORE LETTERS** and TECHNICAL NOTES**■ ■ from Walter H. Breen**

(TN-20A)

Regarding Mr. T.D. Howe's observations and questions on the time of manufacture of the Mark Newbie pieces (TN-20, CNL March 1970, page 299) one can easily guess that the owners of royalist coins like the Mark Newbie halfpence and farthings would have concealed them in quantity during the Commonwealth. As for why they were not circulated in the 1660's: how do you know they were not? But they would have been once again saved rather than spent after the royal farthings (inscribed CAROLUS A CAROLO) began to be issued in 1672. After the late 1670's coppers were once again uncirculated in an attempt to subsidize the enterprise of British tin-mine owners, the tin farthings being issued as late as 1688 (the last ones being the VAL 24 PART REAL pieces for the American Plantations, during a couple of months of the reign of James II). So while hardly any small change was available aside from tin farthings, which crumbled into nothingness every winter, out came the old Newbie coppers and others -- tradesmen's tokens in particular -- of anything like suitable farthing weight.

**■ ■ from Edward R. Barnsley  
Beach Haven, New Jersey**

(TN-28A)

I want to say in reference to TN-28 (CNL, January 1971, page 313) that I agree whole heartedly with Don Norton's idea for a new designation in the Vermont Series, i.e., Ryder 39, it being the same die combination as Miller 1-I of the 1788 Connecticut Series. In fact I had suggested this very thing ten years ago, as did Ken Bressett when he prepared his beautiful photographic plates of the Vermont Series to which he unfortunately assigned the unpublished hence unacceptable Breen-Boyd attributions.

It should be noted that three Connecticut reverses are muled with at least six obverse dies of other series, hence these odd balls have, of necessity, been given Connecticut identifications. These are (1) mules with GEORGIVS III REX obverses, viz: 100-I, 101-D, and 101-G.2; and (2) mules with VERMON AUCTORI obverses, viz: 124-I, 128-I, and 129-I.

**■ ■ from Charles E. Funk  
East Granby, Connecticut**

(TN-30)

Can any of our Patrons refer me to a publication describing the coinage used in the Dutch colonies in North America? There were several such colonies, and at least two -- those that are now known as New York and as Hartford, Conn. -- were in existence under Dutch control for periods of some years, back in the seventeenth century.

There must have been some coinage in use in these colonies, yet the closest reference that I've found to indicate that there may have been anything other than the normal

coinage of the Netherlands is in Illustrated Encyclopedia of World Coins by Hobson and Obojski (Doubleday, 1970), where on page 434 -- the topic under discussion being United States Colonial Coins -- the authors say ".... the Dutch did bring coins to the New World. Before New Netherland was lost to the English in 1664, one type of coin which came over in fair quantity was the so-called "dog", actually a "lion" dollar, made of base silver."

Nowhere else, in any discussion of North American colonial coinage, have I seen any reference to any coinage in or for the Dutch colonies, although there is no dearth of information on that of the British, French, or Spanish. Are Hobson and Obojski correct in saying that especially minted Lion Dollars were struck for the Dutch colonies? If so, don't these deserve consideration as part of the colonial series? Is anything known about the extent to which the silver was debased? Could there have been any struck in copper, perhaps silver plated?

One might correctly deduce that my interest in this matter is not entirely academic. I do have in my possession a Lion Dollar (the Dutch seem to spell it "leeuwendaalder") that is most certainly debased - it is, in fact, struck in copper. Its date is 1644, and the legend indicates that, of the several city-states that made up the United Netherlands, this one came from West Frisia. There is now no trace of silver plating on the coin, but one of the several people to whom I've shown it commented that the appearance of the striking indicated that to them the copper had probably been silvered before striking.

Do I have, perhaps, an "American Colonial" of Dutch origin? I hope that someone may either know the answer, or be able to refer me to someplace where I can find it out. Meanwhile the piece rests among the other "colonials" in my collection. I hope I can find the justification for keeping it there.

I have been in correspondence with John Davenport - the expert on European crowns - and he has no knowledge of a leeuwendaalder in copper. I have also shown it to the curator of the ANS collection, and he dismissed it as a "contemporary forgery". This it may well be - in fact, probably is - but this still doesn't negate the possibility that it may have been intended, and used, by the Dutch settlers in America. Much of the Machin Mills output also qualifies as contemporary forgeries, but it is no less an object of interest to the student and collector of "colonials".

Any leads will be welcome.



## A Biennial Pairing Puzzle



5.2 of 1786



7.2 of 1785

■ ■ from Richard F. Buckley  
Medford, Mass.

(TN-31)

The photographs are of the obverses of two Connecticut coppers; on the left is a 5.2-I of 1786, and on the right is a 7.2-D of 1785. I submit these as evidence for my comments which follow concerning Mr. Edward R. Barnsley's interesting article entitled "Biennial Pairings of Connecticut Obverses" which appeared in Serial No. 22 (April 1968).

After careful study and comparison of the two obverses, I am convinced that they are struck from the same die. The fact that the two busts and all their details are exact replicas could, of course, be explained by saying that the dies were the product of the same master hub; however, the shape, spacing, and very minute details of the letters in the legend, and their positions in relationship to each other and to the respective busts, lead me to the conclusion that the dies are one and the same. Measurements from various points on the legend to other points match exactly on the coins. Such details could not have been so perfectly duplicated from die to die.

The really interesting thing about this pair, however, is the presence of colons in the 5.2 obverse legend. Mr. Barnsley points out in his article that obverse 7.2 of 1785 is the same die as obverse 4.2 of 1786. Noting the heavy die break on the 1785 variety, he further states that the striking sequence was in reverse chronological order. That is to say, the 1786 4.2 obverse was struck before the 1785 obverse. Please note that neither of these dies have colons appearing in their legends. Yet - there they are on the 1786 5.2 obverse! Furthermore, there is no trace of the severe die damage in the area of the back of the neck on the 5.2 variety which is the hallmark of the obverse 7.2 of 1785!

There are two other points that I would like to mention about these pieces. I do not know how obvious these will be in the photograph, but the specimen of the 5.2-I is in a very nice state of preservation. What appears at first glance to be circulation

wear is actually more the result of being struck from a very shallow die. The other point is that it would have been much simpler in Colonial times to have added devices such as colons into a die, after some usage, than to remove them.

Probably it would have been easier to grind down a die deep enough to remove a chip or a crack than to remove a device purposely sunk as a part of the design.

All of this evidence leads me to a conclusion somewhat different than that of Mr. Barnsley. I respectfully submit the suggestion that the die was first used in 1785 in marriage with reverse D of that year. After the severe damage, the obverse die was ground down and reworked, and the 1786 4.2 pairings were struck. Subsequently, for some reason that is hard to explain, colons were added to the legend, and the 5.2 matings were produced.

If this is, in fact, the case, I wonder if other seemingly reverse chronological strikings could be reconsidered in the same light. I would appreciate reading some comments from Mr. Barnsley and other interested CNL Patrons on this subject.



Editor's note:

For the purpose of obtaining better photographic reproduction we have substituted a different photograph of obverse 7.2 of 1785 for the one submitted to us by Mr. Buckley. The specimen illustrated is the one which appeared in Mr. Barnsley's article and shows the details of lettering much more clearly than the Buckley photograph. However, what this substitute photograph does not show, in addition to the points made by Mr. Buckley in his letter, is the fact that the denticulation above the bust and around toward the 3 o'clock position is identical on both dies. Photographic overlays indicate that these, too, match in every detail.

Mr. Buckley submitted these observations to us more than a year ago and we have been doing some cooperative investigations since that time to determine whether these two dies are (with the exception of the two colons) identical. Some of our thoughts and conclusions will be mentioned in a future issue. In the meantime - what are our Patrons' thoughts on this subject?

